UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/717,667	11/21/2003	Andreas Kaszkin	Q78536	9058
23373 SUGHRUE MI	7590 11/04/200 <b>ON. PLLC</b>	EXAMINER		
2100 PENNSY	LVANIA AVENUE, N	TRUONG, THANHNGA B		
SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2435	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/04/2008	PAPER

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/717,667	KASZKIN ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Thanhnga B. Truong	2435	

	Thaninga B. Tracing	2400
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 21 October 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appelor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	it, or other evidence, which places the with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	g date of the final rejection.	
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07( Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing data	of the fee. The appropriate extension fee inally set in the final Office action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two months of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any externation Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w  AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, I</li> <li>(a) They raise new issues that would require further colling</li> <li>(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below)</li> </ol>	nsideration and/or search (see NO	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	ter form for appeal by materially re	
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected ciaims.
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		
<ul> <li>6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s).</li> <li>7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)</li> </ul>		
how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  Claim(s) allowed:  Claim(s) objected to:  Claim(s) rejected:  Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		ii be entered and an explanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>		
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attached.
The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u>	t does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowance because:
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s).</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)	
	/Thanhnga B. Truong/	
	Primary Examiner, Art U	Jnit 2435

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant has argued that:

Chen discloses encoding and not encrypting a purchase order, PO (col. 4, lines 58 to 67). That is, Chen only discloses converting plain text (purchase order PO) into XML code, i.e., encoding the PO. Chen, however, is unrelated to encyrption i.e., transforming data so that it is unreadable to anyone without a key. In other words, Chen discloses encoding and not encrypting data. One of ordinary skill in the art would not take from Chen's disclosure of encoding any teaching or suggestion regarding the claimed encryption.

Examiner respectfully disagrees with applicant and still maintains that:

Chen's encoding is the same as invention's encryption. Technically speaking, encoding is the process of transforming information from one format into another and encryption transforms information for secrecy. Functionality, they are both the same by transforming information into something that is unreadable. In addition, the specification of the instant application (paragraph [0005], lines 3-5) shows the data packaged in the email can be encrypted and then decrypted again on extraction from the email and prior to being forwarded. It is understood that email is the text message being encrypted before sending/transmitting, which is exactly the same functionality as Chen's encoding for encoding a purchase order.

Besides, Takagi also teaches the encrypting process in column 4, lines 11-45, wherein The first processing means which has been granted the information exchange sends the transmissin data to the first communication means, and the first communication means 1 uses the random number data provided by the random number generation means to encrypt the entered transmission data and sends it to the card terminal. The encrypted data received by the card terminal is entered to the second communication means, and the second communication means uses the random number data received from the IC card to decrypt the entered encrypted data and enters it to the second communication means uses the random number data received from the IC card to encrypt the entered data and sends it to the IC card. The encrypted data received by the IC card is entered to the first communication means, and the first communication means uses the random number data provided by the random number generation means to decrypt the entered encrypted data and enters it to the first processing means. Through the repetition of the foregoing processes, the IC card performs the information encryption process and decryption process by using the random number data generated in the IC card for the encryption key and decryption key, and the card terminal performs the information encryption process and decryption process by using the random number data received from the IC card, for the encryption key and decryption key, thereby performing the information exchange based on the cryptograph between the IC card and card terminal.

Applicant further argues that:

Chen does not disclose process devices exchanging some but less than all data in the encrypted form, thereby determining by hard wiring or programming which of transmission data are to be encrypted and recognizing which of reception data are encrypted and have to be decrypted. In other words, Chen is unrelated to encrypting only some of the transmitted data and having a device that will analyze the received data and distinguish between encrypted and unencrypted data in these received data. In short, Chen does not disclose or suggest identifying which of the received data needs to be encrypted.

Examiner respectfully disagrees with applicant and still maintains that:

Chen teaches a system for exchanging and merging messages over a network includes a server accessible by a plurality of remote browsers for transmitting a template including fields for information entry and a business system accessible by the server for generating a return message pursuant to information entered in the template on the browsers. The business system includes a first parser for receiving a message from a browser, the message including information about data characteristics of information entered into the template, and a second parser for receiving information about data characteristics to provide a return template. A merging algorithm is implemented to merge the message with the return template for providing a return message to the browser having portions of the return template with data entered therein (see Figures 5 and 6 and column 1, lines 35-48. Chen further teaches, in the illustrative example shown in FIG. 6, a buyer runs a web server 206. In step 201, a supplier can visit the buyer's web site to view PO's using a standard web browser 207. The supplier may decide to create a corresponding invoice from the received PO by submitting a "prepare invoice" request 202 to the web server. The XML document exchange/merge system 105 on the buyer side is invoked and dynamically generates a partial invoice 202'. The partial invoice in XML format is transmitted over the Internet and displayed on supplier's browser 203. The supplier can edit the partial invoice 204, and submit the completed invoice back to the buyer for record handling or auditing 205.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)and In re Jones, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, (1) although Chen teaches a process automation system, Chen is silent on the capability of showing wherein, in at least a first of the process devices, a communication device determines by hard wiring or programming which of transmission data are encrypted in an encryption device of the first process device, and wherein, in at least a second of the process devices, the communication device recognizes which of reception data are

the second process device. On the other hand, Takagi teaches these limitations in Figure 9 and more details in column 1, lines 17-43, column 6, lines 35-45 of Takagi. (2) Although Chen teaches the claimed subject matter and the encoding process, Chen is silent on the capability of showing how the encoding process related to the authentication process. On the other hand, Takagi and Fiszman teaches further comprising a central key administration that registers public encryption keys of the process devices and authenticates the public encryption keys with a private encryption key of the central key administration (column 5, line 20 through column 6, line 12 of Takagi; and column 8, lines 34-40 and column 19, lines 54-59 of Fiszman). Thus, the combination of teaching between Chen, Takagi, and Fiszman is efficient and proper.

Chen, Takagi, and Fiszman do not need to disclose anything over and above the invention as claimed in order to render it unpatentable or anticipate. A recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claimed limitations.

The fact that Examiner may not have specifically responded to any particular arguments made by Applicant and Applicant's Representative, should not be construed as indicating Examiner's agreement therewith.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.